

the American people think that higher taxes will hurt the economy. We are a conservative Nation, Madam Speaker. And I would tell you that what the voters said on Election Day is that they want conservative policies in place. Voters opted for the more conservative candidate and more conservative side of most issues. Nine States passed measures to restrict the government's ability to take land through eminent domain, taking private property for government use or public use.

Voters in Colorado, Idaho, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia and Wisconsin passed constitutional amendments to define marriage as between one man and one woman. Now a majority of States have enacted those constitutional protections stopping liberal judges from redefining marriage. We are a conservative Nation, Madam Speaker, and similar amendments on marriage have passed across the country in previous elections and will continue to happen going forward.

Previous Democratic wins in 1974 and 1986 swept into office new and very liberal freshman classes. If we look at the new Democrat freshman class of 2006, they are not liberals, Madam Speaker. What is striking is that this freshman class campaigned as conservatives. In fact, I know of one candidate who went out and advocated for certain principles. They might ring true to me as a Republican. He said he is pro-life, he is pro-gun. He is for traditional marriage, tax cuts, and for balancing the budget and a strong national defense. Sounds like a Republican to me, but he is a registered Democrat.

Pro-life Democrats were elected in North Carolina, Indiana, Ohio and Pennsylvania, just to name a few. Pro-gun Democrats were elected in Florida, Indiana, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Vermont. Wow, those are conservative principles, and I will tell you that it is a call to conservatives, to Republicans, to be true to those conservative issues we ran on originally.

After the Republicans' last electoral disaster, then-California Governor Ronald Reagan spoke before the Conservative Political Action Conference and said, "Our people look for a cause to believe in. Is it a third party we need, or is it a new and revitalized second party, raising a banner of no pale pastels, but bold colors, which make it unmistakably clear where we stand on all of the issues troubling the people."

Madam Speaker, Ronald Reagan said that in 1975. These bold colors underpin our conservative platform, and that is what we must return to as a governing majority in the next election. As Republicans, that is what we should stand for.

Ronald Reagan went on to say, "We have just heard a call to arms based on that platform, and a call to us to really be successful to communicating and reveal to the American people the difference between this platform and the

platform of the opposing party, which is nothing but a revamp and a reissue and a running of a late, late show of the thing that we have been hearing from them for the last 40 years."

He said that 30 years ago. So I would submit to you today the Democrat platform is just what it has been for the last 70 years, but the new freshman class advocated a platform similar to what the Republicans have been advocating for the last 50 years.

Madam Speaker, I would tell you this election was a wake-up call for us to return to those bold colors and return to conservative values.

#### WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, the people have spoken. The election is over and they have said to us that they have given us their marching orders.

For 40 months American soldiers have been suffering, working, and dying for their country in the Iraq war. Since that day, 2,800 Americans have been killed. More than 20,000 have been wounded, most in gruesome fashion, and we have spent \$450 billion when Secretary Wolfowitz told us the Congress would pass only \$3 billion in appropriations to fund this curious exercise.

According to the National Intelligence Estimate, we have been made less safe. The other members of the axis of evil, Iran and North Korea, have developed or are developing nuclear weapons. We have forgotten our mission in Afghanistan where a democratically elected government is slowly losing control of the country.

The war in Iraq has produced more terrorists. According to the National Intelligence Estimate, it has found that the Iraq war has created more terrorists and terrorist sympathizers than have been destroyed. Iraq has become the central front in the war on terrorism, simply because this administration has made it so.

Vice President CHENEY said the insurgency was on its last throes, and more Americans die every month than did when the actual war itself was going on. Again, the National Intelligence Estimates said that fanatical terrorism has metastasized and spread across the globe.

At each and every turning point: The toppling of Saddam Hussein's statue; the dissolving the Iraqi Army; the creation of the Iraqi constitution; the vote for the constitution; the parliamentary elections; the capture of Saddam; or the death of Zarqawi, the Bush administration has told us victory is at hand.

Meanwhile, the bloodshed intensifies, hope dims, and more Americans come home with terrible wounds or in body bags.

Madam Speaker, this Nation has to have a plan and it is time that the President, whose war this is, come forward with such plan as to how we can win. Staying the course has failed. Americans will support what has to be done to get us out with honor and dignity and to win. Now the President can claim that he has the power to do these things, and clearly under the Constitution he does; but the President also has the duty to come forward with a plan that can be understood, accepted, carried out, implemented and successful for the American people.

If we are committed to staying in Iraq, the President must face the American people and adequately prepare them for the truth: The truth that his desires for Iraq will take more soldiers, more money, and cost more lives.

The American people respect and admire leadership and honesty. They admired it in Roosevelt, in Truman and in Ronald Reagan. Honesty begins with making an honest accounting of the costs and coming forward with a truthful statement of where we are and what we must do. If this Nation needs more equipment for our soldiers or needs more soldiers over there, then we must be told that and the President must face that, and we must do what has to be done to see to it that we have the proper forces there to prevail.

This war is being charged to our children and grandchildren. We need to examine whether or not it is just and proper for us to do that. We must pursue with vigor the diplomatic front. The countries in the area must be involved, and certainly little sign of that taking place is visible to all of us.

We have to swallow our pride. Let us talk to everyone, reengage the Syrians and the Iranians, in addition to those countries who are our allies in the region. And as we approach the fourth year of this war, and it must be observed that is longer than we were committed to the war in Europe in 1945, Syria and Iran have to be explored as possible participants in the solution to the problems which exist there.

The President must look the American people directly in the eye and he must deal honestly with our people. He must provide the generals with what they need and not shortchange our troops. We have only one option, and that is to either win or to get out.

Mr. President, your country asks you if Iran is so central to our security in the future, why haven't you made it possible to win and why have you not provided our military with the assets and the strategy that they need to win at the earliest time?

I was a soldier in World War II. Our purpose then was to win quickly, to win strongly, and to do so at the least cost to our people. Victory was our goal, and we were committed to it and we worked for it.

In this world the only thing that will count in this matter is success. In this war there has not been strong leadership from the White House to achieve

our goals. As the President dithers, American soldiers are killed and maimed. Let's win or get out.

#### REMEMBERING BOB GOLDWATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning in remembrance of a great American and great Arizonan, Bob Goldwater. If the last name sounds familiar, it should. The brother of Arizona's favorite son, Bob Goldwater labored alongside his brother in the family business in Phoenix, Goldwater's Department Store, and Bob was his own unique contributor to his brother Barry's political success and to the continued success of Goldwater's Department Store.

Bob Goldwater possessed a laconic wit. Madam Speaker, in my first campaign for public office, I was honored to have Bob Goldwater and former Governor Jack Williams, and the former Republican leader of this House, John J. Rhodes, cosponsor an event for me in the White Mountains of Arizona. This was at a time when I aspired to represent the Sixth Congressional District, an area in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and so to get from suburban Phoenix up to the White Mountains was quite an undertaking that was made a bit more difficult by an incredible thunderstorm because this was during what we call the monsoon season in the summertime in Arizona.

The late great Governor Williams, a former broadcaster, was a stickler for time. The event was supposed to start at 7 p.m. I blew in the door at 7:05. There stood Governor Williams and Leader Rhodes and brother Goldwater. Governor Williams said, "HAYWORTH, 7:00; it's 7:05," to which Bob Goldwater replied, "Oh, heck, keep your shirt on, Jack, booze isn't going to spoil."

At the memorial service for his brother Barry, Bob Goldwater spoke not only of Barry Goldwater, the public servant, but of Barry, his brother. He reminisced how both he and Barry played for their church in a youth basketball league and how Barry suggested that the jerseys they wore should bear the letter "P." Bob recalled that he asked Barry why, and Barry responded, "You know, Bob, P for 'Piscopalian.'"

Perhaps a function of age and time, but the passing of other noteworthy Arizonans would bring Bob Goldwater into the public eye and he, above all other Arizonans, could deliver a heartfelt, humorous, poetic and practical remembrance. I don't have those abilities here today, but I just felt compelled in a moment perhaps of personal indulgence but perhaps more accurately a moment of official reflection, to bring notice to the passing of Bob Goldwater,

bring insight into the very human and humorous way he described others.

And also, to make this note: To my knowledge, Bob Goldwater never ran for public office, although he hailed from an Arizona family synonymous with public service. A lesson that has been impressed upon me through the years and especially in recent days is this fact, that public service is not always defined by public office, that it is what a person does in his fellowship of faith, in his community, in his business that can distinguish that person, a good lesson to remember in these days, a lesson typified by the life and times of Bob Goldwater.

Madam Speaker, those of us who knew Bob count ourselves not lucky but blessed to have a man who championed the success of his brother politically but added immeasurably to the lives of Arizonans in terms of commerce and public service, and as the father of our Phoenix Open.

Rest in peace, Bob Goldwater, you won't be forgotten.

#### AUTHORIZING GOVERNMENT TO NEGOTIATE LOWER PRICES WITH DRUG COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, last week America went to the polls and sent Washington a message that they wanted a new direction. Unfortunately, when it comes to the Bush administration, it seems as though the voters' call for change has fallen upon deaf ears.

Yesterday, the New York Times reported that the President and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Mike Leavitt, were "strenuously opposed to legislation that would authorize the government to negotiate with drug companies to secure lower drug prices for Medicare beneficiaries."

This is not groundbreaking news. They have said all along that they oppose negotiated prices in the Medicare program. Still, given the outcome of last week's election, it is disappointing that this administration would not even take a moment to reconsider its misguided policies.

Mr. Leavitt went on to say, "I don't believe I can do a better job than an efficient market." I agree that the secretary hasn't done such a good job so far, but he shouldn't get too down on himself, he is not entirely to blame. His Republican friends here in Congress have kept him from realizing his potential by legally prohibiting him from negotiating with drug makers.

However, if a Democratic Congress passed a law granting him authority to negotiate prices with drug manufacturers, I am certain we could achieve enormous savings in the Medicare program which could be passed on to

America's elderly and disabled in the form of more generous coverage. Indeed, there is a lot of evidence to support this conclusion.

Take, for instance, a study considered earlier this year by the consumer group FamiliesUSA. They compared prices under private prescription drug plans participating in Medicare part D to the prices available through the Department of Veterans Affairs' health system. Their research showed that the government could help lower costs substantially. From November 2005 to April 2006, FamiliesUSA found that virtually all of the part D plans raised their prices for the majority of the top 20 drugs in this study. The median price increase among part D plans for the top 20 drugs prescribed to seniors was 3.7 percent.

Furthermore, for all of the top 20 drugs prescribed to seniors, VA prices in April were lower than the lowest prices charged by part D plans. The median price difference was 46 percent. In other words, Madam Speaker, for half of the 20 drugs, the lowest price charged by any part D plan was at least 46 percent higher than the lowest price secured for the VA. This is what the secretary must be referring to when he talks about the magic of the market.

My Republican friends argue that allowing the secretary to negotiate lower drug prices cannot actually work because the government will act to set prices. This is just more of the same old excuses we have been hearing all along. The truth of the matter is that the President, Secretary Leavitt, and Republicans in Congress are opposed to negotiated prices simply because they want to preserve the profits of the pharmaceutical industry which this program was really written for.

I have to be honest here. The American taxpayer is being ripped off by the Republican prescription drug law. Pharmaceutical companies have reaped record profits since Medicare part D was implemented while the American taxpayer has been left holding the bill.

Before the Republican law went into effect this year, more than 6.5 million low-income Americans received help for their prescription drug bills through Medicaid. Under the Medicaid system, however, States can purchase drugs at the lowest available prices or the best price. While this was good news for the taxpayer, it certainly cut into the profit margins of the pharmaceutical industry. So now those same 6.5 million Americans have been moved into the Republican prescription drug plan. They are no longer receiving the lower prices, and the higher costs, adding up to as much as \$2 billion this year alone, will be passed on to the American taxpayer.

This is why American voters rejected the Republican platform last week. Republican policies over the past decade have served special interests like the pharmaceutical industry, and now the American taxpayer is paying the price. Clearly voters are fed up, and they